



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Hague declaring "that it is eminently desirable that the governments should undertake afresh the serious study of the limitation of military expenditure."

IX.

The assembly of the representatives of the peace societies of the world at Berne, September 26, expresses its profound gratitude to the President of the United States for his effort to conclude unrestricted arbitration treaties with Great Britain, France, and other nations. These treaties are the promise of a new era in arbitration and the development of international justice. Their failure in any degree, after the high hopes which the promise of their adoption has raised throughout the world, would be a serious blow to human progress. We respectfully and earnestly petition the American Senate and people to remember that at this critical juncture they are the custodians not only of the special interests of the United States, but also of the general welfare of the family of nations. No unessential political considerations should be permitted to defeat or menace the broad purpose of President Taft; and we appeal to the American Government and people with the greater confidence in remembrance of their advanced positions at The Hague conferences and in the whole history of international arbitration.

THE TRIPOLI EMBROGLIO.

I.

The General Assembly of the Berne Bureau, deeply concerned about the risks of war which have just arisen between Italy and Turkey, in regard to Tripoli;

Considering that Tripoli is neither an uninhabited territory nor a minor State, but that it belongs to a constitutional State admitted into the family of nations,

Expresses its indignation at the nationalist activities which may bring the Italian government to acts of hostility of the usual order; and

Implores the people and the government of Italy to resist the excitation to war and to keep the development of their national policy and the maintenance of their special interests in Africa within the limits of law, and expresses the strong hope that, in case of conflict, they will make it a point of honor to have recourse to the pacific methods of mediation, arbitration, or international conference.

II.

A. The assembly notes that the Tripolitan trouble which has just arisen is the natural consequence of the egoistic policy which has generally been followed by the civilized powers in dealing with weak or small peoples, and in particular by France and Germany in regard to Morocco.

B. It expresses once more its condemnation of the policy of grab by virtue of which the powers seek to re-establish, at the expense of neutral and weak peoples, the political equilibrium which has been broken by the territorial acquisitions of others.

C. It expresses regret that France and Germany have allowed themselves to be led by circumstances to abandon, with common accord, the solid ground of international pacific agreement established by the Act of Algiers.

John Bright, Advocate of Peace.

By Rev. F. Stanley Van Eps.

A hundred years ago there was born in England, on November 16, of Quaker parents, a man who was destined to be one of the greatest of the world's advocates of peace—John Bright. It has been a wonderful century—truly "an age on ages telling." Sometimes it seems as if almost all that makes for the comfort and the convenience of our earthly life has come within this period: the discoveries and inventions that have revolutionized industry, the democracy that has changed government and society, the commercial development that has brought the whole human race into brotherhood, the missionary activity that has brought civilization and spirituality to all the world.

The Bright family can be traced back to 1684, two years later than Penn's founding his colony of Friends in America, embodying the principles of peace in government and in dealing with the Indians and other people of the region. Originally of the Established Church, the family early joined the Society of Friends, numerous in Wiltshire, in which region of England we first find the family. Coventry became the home of Abraham Bright and his Jewish wife, after living years in Lyneham. Their son William's son Jacob was John Bright's grandfather. This Jacob married Martha Lucas, and of their eight children Jacob, John's father, was the youngest. Jacob came to Rochdale in 1802 as a book-keeper in a mill, and in 1809 he took an old mill and established the business that has ever since continued in the family. John's mother was Martha Wood, the second wife of Jacob. There were eleven children, John being the second. In that home, filled with the sweet spirit characteristic of the Friends, in which simple living and noble thinking and doing prevailed, John imbibed the principles which ever dominated him, and learned to practice them along with both his parents in daily life. They were both persons of rare excellence.

His schooling was received at home, in a cottage fitted up as a school, at Ackworth, at York, and at Newton. At fifteen he left school and entered his father's business. He was certainly not a school-made man—not a university man; but he was an educated man in all that is truly excellent in the development of character. He was fond of reading, and remembered what he read. The Bible and Milton were lifelong favorites, influencing his life, his thinking, and his style in speaking and writing.

It is easy to see why he was, as a prominent Non-conformist minister said to me a year ago, "a sort of conscience for the nation." The very life of the Friends—that mystical life of fellowship with the Spirit, that embodying of eternal principles in actual daily life and work—he found in the home in which he was born, and in himself awaiting development. He had the immeasurable advantage of such a beginning.

As a boy he came into contact with the conditions in which the people all about him lived—or existed. On his plastic personality were made impressions that never left him. He got his facts at first hand as a boy. He could not help thinking as he saw what he saw and heard what he heard. Those were times of suffering, and the causes were not far away and in clear sight.

Poverty and wretchedness little better than slavery held the people, and at the same time the rich and the mighty had no serious regard for them. The very pleadings and efforts of the suffering seemed to bring upon them even worse suffering. Everywhere was injustice, oppression, and wrong of all kinds.

The beginnings of his public work were in efforts for the causes of temperance, speaking in school-houses and in chapels. He wrote his speeches and committed them to memory—a laborious method, but serving to discipline his mind. A Baptist minister gave him the secret of speaking freely. From such simple beginnings he went on developing in actual service through his many years, attaining the eminence of Britain's greatest living orator, even in the time of Mr. Gladstone.

John Bright's great opportunity came when Richard Cobden asked him to come with him and work for the repeal of the Corn Laws that were at the bottom of all the ills of the time, as he thought—the tariff on grain. In the depths of his own sorrow at the death of his young wife he was visited by Mr. Cobden, whom he had met in the course of his oratorical efforts and in the literary society of which he was a member. The reform agitation had stirred him greatly, and he never forgot it. In that great work in which he was associated with Mr. Cobden, the two men so necessary to each other, Cobden as the man of facts and reasoning and Bright the man of eloquence and power, there was brought about such a change in the policy of England that never since has free trade ceased to be dominant. The great victory gained finally in 1846, after several years of incessant work, brought Bright to such power and prominence that he was elected to Parliament, and remained there, with brief intermissions, until his death, March 27, 1889.

The services of John Bright as advocate of peace were many, both direct and indirect. Peace at home he regarded as necessary, if there was to be any kind of right condition. But there could not be peace so long as there were such wrongs dominant as the tariff on the things necessary to life. Then it was necessary, if home conditions be what they ought to be, that there should be peace and friendly relations with other nations. But it was fundamentally a moral question with John Bright, as indeed every other question was with him, this question of peace at home and abroad. The same principles of rightness apply to individuals and to nations. No doubt Mr. Bright's own view was that of the Society of Friends—that war is a moral wrong under any and all circumstances, and in the last analysis is to be opposed on that ground. Morality and religion were at the foundation of all human action, whether single or social. In all his speeches one finds that the ultimate argument, so far as he was personally concerned, was moral—the very highest argument—for it goes to the eternal realities and bases all conduct on what cannot change.

But Mr. Bright was in a nation famous for fighting, proud of the victories won by her armies and navies, and determined to maintain that supremacy so dearly achieved, and Mr. Bright was pre-eminently a practical man. He sought throughout his career to elevate mankind by appealing to the highest and best in man. He had confidence in the common people, whom he regarded as his own people, to whom he belonged. He was a teacher and a leader, seeking to reach the highest judg-

ment and will of the people. The concrete facts and realities, on which there can be no opinion, he sought to bring forth as the basis of his practical arguments in his opposition to what he considered wrong and in his advocacy of what he considered right.

Because he did take such high moral ground he was opposed by those politicians and by those other persons whose self-interest led them to disregard the right in order to secure their own ends. When Mr. Bright opposed so strongly the Crimean war, continuing even after the war had been declared, and never ceasing to condemn it as wrong and inexcusable, he was called a traitor to his own country. He opposed the spirit that leads to war, and all the measures of government that lead to war, and all the preparations and expenditures that increase the military. I think, then, that we may say that Mr. Bright's ideal was to do away with war and establish universal peace because peace is the right state and war is morally wrong in itself.

But as a matter to be dealt with, an issue to be met, a thing to persuade others who had not his sense of right developed, who cannot at once be brought to the highest ideal, it was necessary to argue from the best common ground on which agreement would be likely to be practically possible. It was not compromise with wrong, but getting as near right as practicable at the time.

All this will be clearer, perhaps, if we let Mr. Bright speak for himself, as he did in writing to a minister who had written him declaring that "peace at any price" was an untenable position, and that the Egyptian war seemed a righteous war. There were those who criticised Mr. Bright, thinking that he condemned all war and advocated peace at any price. He wrote the Rev. Thomas Rippon, of Warrington:

"The *Spectator* and other supporters of this war answer me by saying that I oppose the war because I condemn all war. The same thing was said during the Crimean war. I have not opposed any war on the ground that all war is unlawful and immoral. I have never expressed such an opinion. I have discussed these questions of war—Chinese, Crimean, Afghan, Zulu, Egyptian—on grounds common to and admitted by all thoughtful men, and have condemned them with arguments which, I believe, have never been answered.

"I will not discuss the abstract question. I shall be content when we reach the point at which all Christian men will condemn war when it is unnecessary, unjust, and leading to no useful or good results. We are far from that point now, but we make some way towards it.

"But of this war I may say this—that it has no better justification than other wars which have gone before it, and that doubtless when the blood is shed and the cost paid, and the results seen and weighed, we shall be generally of that opinion.

"Perhaps the bondholders and those who have made money by it, and those who have got promotion and titles and pensions, will defend it; but thoughtful and Christian men will condemn it."

This, I think, may be taken as his own statement of his views and practice throughout his long career. This was at the time of his resigning from Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet, in 1882, on account of disagreeing with the administration on the moral law as applied to the Egyptian war.

Now, specifically, it seems to me that Mr. Bright's

work for peace consisted in his work for the direct betterment of the people of his own country, which he sought through the repeal of the Corn Laws and bringing free trade as the settled policy of England, and through the reforms which he sought and secured in the extension of the franchise to the vast working population of Britain. In this line, too, I would place the removal of the tax on paper and printing, making the newspapers a mighty educating power, and the extension of education in the various ways in which he encouraged and assisted educational means. Then, too, his great speeches, heard by thousands and tens of thousands as he delivered them, and read by untold thousands as they appeared in the papers and since in books, have been of vast potency in the cause of peace. His great personality—so many years loved and revered throughout the civilized world—was in itself a power that wrought unconsciously for the peace of the world.

There were actual wars in which England engaged that Mr. Bright opposed. He mentions five in the words quoted above. The historic development since has proved that he was right. Indeed, one of the interesting features of Mr. Bright's career is his foretelling what has since come to pass. He often referred to events as having been predicted by him. The war with Russia turned out as he said that it would. It may be said, as by an Englishman last year to me, "He was not a constructive statesman." I am not sure what may be meant by a "constructive statesman," if it be not true that Mr. Bright built up the best in English affairs, internal and external. Every measure that he ever tried to bring forward into enactment was really for the good of the people and the government. If the nation had taken his advice and had done as he pleaded that it should do, it would have been far better off today.

There were periodic war scares gotten up by interested parties—the military and other classes who profited by war and by warlike preparations. These John Bright opposed, and sought to quiet people from their fears, and he succeeded in good measure. But when the war spirit had been worked up to a certain pitch there was no human being who could stem the awful tide that bore to their doom so many thousands mad with the war lust, together with innocent victims. Now it was France that was secretly plotting an invasion; now it was some other nation that was going to humiliate Britain. These always attended the estimates for military expenditure.

Mr. Bright opposed the immense expenditure for military preparation when there was no war probable. He regarded the very possession of an army and a navy, beyond what might be necessary as a national police, as provoking war, and today this is seen with unmistakable clearness. He was criticised for not opposing in the committees of the House these proposals for military expenditure, and he showed that Mr. Hume fought the estimates systematically for forty years, and yet could not keep them down. He suggested a system that would accomplish the object, but it was not adopted. "We should not accept what the Horse Guards say, or what the Admiralty says, or what the Cabinet says, but we ought to have an honestly chosen committee of the House of Commons, to whom these matters should be referred, and that committee should recommend whatever changes it thinks proper after taking evidence upon every point. I am of opinion that the time is coming

when the people of England will begin to discover that this question is of very grave importance." So said Mr. Bright in Birmingham November 10, 1868, and it may be that the people of England have made that discovery.

Every war was followed by increased expenditure for the army and navy, for they seemed unwilling ever to let the amount fall back from the point gained, thus preventing any retrenchment, even in times of peace. The same thing is observable today. Thus war debt has kept accumulating, as Mr. Bright showed, and there seems to be no way of ever paying off the principal, even if the interest can be met. The present network of affairs in Britain, with all its complications, might be far less troublesome if John Bright had had his way in governmental affairs. He constantly kept pleading for business methods in government affairs, in diplomacy as well as in exchequer.

This brings us to note his objection to the foreign policy that so long prevailed, especially under the long career of Lord Palmerston. The interference of England in the affairs of other nations, bringing on wars in certain cases and danger of wars in all cases, Mr. Bright opposed. Meddling in the internal as well as in the external affairs of other nations was indeed the thing that cost England vast sums. Then there was that other thing that disturbed Mr. Bright—the "balance of power"—that was so hard to maintain. But there did come a change, and England did give up the chase so long continued—two centuries—for that ghastly phantom never overtaken—the balance of power. So good are the words of Mr. Bright that one with difficulty resists the temptation to quote:

"And now let us look at the facts in a reasonable manner. What does the £26,000,000 spent on the army and navy mean? It means something equal to the debt of £800,000,000 sterling which our forefathers spent in folly and wrong, and the interest on which your taxes pay. It means that there is virtually another sum of £800,000,000, the interest of which you are paying in taxes in order to keep up a great army and a great navy. And when? Not only in a time of profound peace, but when no country in the world menaces or distrusts us; when there is not a cloud in the sky; when, if ever there was a time at which the United Kingdom may be said to be in tranquillity and peace, the time at which I am speaking is that time. If you look back over the history of England from the time of the Revolution—from the time of William III to the end of the Russian war—you will find that almost every war in which we have been engaged was based on the utter folly and absurdity that this nation is called upon to maintain the balance of power in Europe. I hope that we have abandoned that policy and given up that delusion; that we have got free from that aberration, and are at last in our right mind. May we not, then, calculate that if we keep out of the former hallucination, if we retain that sound mind, if we for the next fifty years or one hundred years resolve to maintain our present policy of not meddling in the affairs of Europe, that we shall be at least as free from wars in one hundred years to come as we might have been in the one hundred years that are past? If that be so, if there be any hope of it—and I believe there is—I ask why we should go on paying £26,000,000 sterling a year for the cost of an army and a navy?"

This paragraph from a speech in Edinburgh, Novem-

ber 5, 1868, is a fine example of John Bright's way of speaking on this subject. Note his knowledge of history and of present affairs of his country, and his cogent way of placing facts before his audience, leaving people to judge for themselves and to act on their own initiative for what is the evident truth and right. Then, too, this was his way of picturing the future as in the control of the people themselves, with the responsibility which ability involves. The centuries of folly, with the burdens entailed, press on us their warning.

America was always a wonderful country to John Bright, and he was a devoted friend in time of America's great need in the Civil War; but he never visited this land of which he so often spoke in commendation and in glowing hope, though urgently invited to come. His modesty and his dislike of show and his love of simplicity kept him from accepting the repeated invitations. He regretted that he had not come here. His speeches on the American question and on Canada show the man in that larger conception of human life than that which is usually called patriotism. When the wealthy and the powerful classes in Britain were all on the side of the South and of slavery, John Bright had the sagacity to see the reality of things beyond the present appearances, and the courage to stand for the right—for the cause of human advancement in freedom. Appreciate his services for peace as we may, we can never fully estimate what he accomplished for America and for the world as he stood for freedom and spoke and wrought for the highest interests of the American people as the future ages would come to understand. His prophetic vision, or common sense—if that be preferred as the designation—enabled him to see what was coming years before the war broke out, and to urge measures that would prevent the disaster that came on the British people when cotton could not be obtained from America. When the British government did things that can never be justified by right thinking men, Mr. Bright stood for the treatment that would keep the two great branches of the English-speaking people in peaceful relations and in the proper friendship that should exist between them. He was no time-server, but one who based his conduct on timeless principles of right and truth, and sought to bring the world to incorporate these in individual and in national conduct.

Nor was it wholly in that trying time only that Mr. Bright was the friend of America. When those matters of arbitration came up, he stood for right as the only true basis of fair dealing and of permanent peace. He was patriotic in the highest sense when he stood, as he did, for right settlement of those unjustifiable deeds connected with the *Alabama* through arbitration, and thus prevented the war that seemed at times imminent—as when in the years before he held for patience in the *Trent* affair; as when, too, he withstood the recognition of the Confederacy.

Again, when the defenses of Canada were under discussion, and the matters that came up in connection with the doings along the border while the Civil War was in progress, Mr. Bright took the right view, as history proves. Those were all times that tested genuine statesmanship, and John Bright was the mainstay of right and of peace when even Mr. Gladstone, admirable and grand as he ever was, seemed not to see with the clearest vision. In this day of attempted closer rela-

tions between the United States and Canada, read a paragraph of John Bright's speech of February 28, 1876, in the House of Commons:

"I believe there is no delusion greater than this, that there is any party in the United States that wishes to commit any aggression upon Canada or to annex Canada by force to the United States. There is not a part of the world, in my opinion, that runs less risk of aggression than Canada, except with regard to that foolish and impotent attempt of certain discontented not-long-ago subjects of the Queen who have left this country. America has no idea of anything of the kind. No American statesman, no American political party, dreams for a moment of an aggression upon Canada or of annexing Canada by force. And therefore every farthing that you spend on your fortresses and all that you do with the idea of shutting out American aggression is money squandered through an hallucination which we ought to get rid of. . . . For my share, I want the population of these provinces to do that which they believe to be best for their own interests—to remain with this country if they like it, in the most friendly manner, or to become independent States if they wish it. If they should prefer to unite themselves with the United States, I should not complain even of that. But whatever be their course, there is no man in this House or in those provinces who has a more sincere wish for their greatness and their welfare than I have who take the liberty thus to criticise this bill."

John Bright advocated peace as the true condition for all the world, irrespective of class distinctions, of nationality, or of other differences among people. He was the friend of all mankind, standing for the highest interests of each and of all. He did not array class against class, but sought to establish such relations between all people as would enable them to live in peace, to work together for the common good, and to develop character and service that would truly ennoble. Freedom of trade the world over; treaties of commerce and treaties of arbitration that would bring people close together in peaceful dealings and exchange of productions, and enable them to settle differences calmly and without resort to force; non-interference in the affairs of other nations; retrenchment of expenditure for army and navy until only police regulations could be maintained; reduction of armaments by all nations—these are among the measures that Mr. Bright supported. How far beyond the politicians of his day he was! We are now, after these many years, coming to see as he saw and to advocate what he advocated, that the great end of international peace might be secured, and, when secured, merely a means to the larger end—the development of mankind in all that is noblest and best physically and socially and industrially, as well as morally and spiritually. Among the great advocates of peace there shall ever stand close up to the front the name of John Bright.

WOODHAVEN, L. I., N. Y.

The American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes holds its conference this year at Cincinnati, the 7th and 8th of this month. Many prominent jurists and public men will take part in the program, including President Taft. The meetings will be held in the Music Hall and the Odeon.